

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is in response the amendment filed on August 24, 2010.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “exchangeable cover” must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-7, 10-15, 18-20 and 30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claimed limitations “exchangeable cover” is not clear that what makes the feature different than the cited references as shows in the application, in figures 1-2, in addition, the claims are not indicating the advantage of having an exchangeable cover over the prior art, as disclosed on the figures 1-2. Further more, Imai teaches a cover in figure 2, which is considered to be an exchangeable cover, as clearly disclosed. Finally, the figures 1-2 in the application is not disclosed an exchangeable cover, as the Applicant claimed. Correction is needed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-7, 10-15, 18-25 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Imai (6,259, 045 B 1) in view of Nguyen et al. (US 7,187,363 B2; hereinafter referred to as Nguyen).

As to claim 1, Imai teaches Cover for an electronic device comprising a decoration (case, figure 2, (20)) which is visible to a user when said cover is connected to an electronic device (figures 1-7 and column 3, lines 1-31); contact sensitive component (electrodes, (figures 2-7, (15 and 41)), column 1, lines 45-61) arranged such that generates an electrical signal when a part ((hole, (figures 2-3, (21)) of said decoration case, figure 2, (20)) associated to said contact sensitive component (electrodes, (figures 2-7, (15 and 41)), is touched (column 1, lines 45-61, column 3, lines 23-30); and a connection component to electrically connecting said contact sensitive component (figures 2-7, column 1, lines 45-61, column 2, lines 30-67, column 3, lines 1-67 and column 4, lines 1-67).

Imai does not teach a processor provided in a cover.

However, Nguyen teaches a processor provided in a cover (column 2, lines 15-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Nguyen's device having a processor in a cover into Imai's electronic system so as to provide protection for the processor (column 2, lines 20-25).

As to claims 2 and 20, Imai teaches wherein said contact sensitive component comprise a pressure sensitive film (figures 2-7, column 1, lines 45-61, column 3, lines 23-30, column 4, lines 1-12 and column 6, lines 16-25).

As to claims 3 and 21, Imai teaches wherein said pressure sensitive film is an

electromechanical film (figures 2-7, column 1, lines 45-61, column 3, lines 60-67, column 4, lines 62-67 and column 6, lines 20-40).

As to claims 4 and 22, Imai teaches wherein said pressure sensitive film comprises at least one force sensitive resistor (figures 2-7, and column 1, lines 45-61).

As to claims 5 and 23, Imai teaches wherein said contact sensitive component comprise at least one capacitive sensor (figures 2-7, column 1, lines 45-61, column 3, lines 23-30, column 3, lines 50-55 and column 4, lines 5-12).

As to claims 6, 14 and 24, Imai teaches wherein different parts (holes, (figures 2-3, (20)) of said decoration associated to said contact sensitive component result in a generation of different signals by said contact sensitive component when touched (figures 2-7, column 1, lines 45-61, column 2, lines 30-67, column 3, lines 1-67 and column 4, lines 1-67).

As to claims 7, 15 and 25, Imai teaches wherein one or more selected parts (holes, (figures 2-3, (20)) of said decoration (case, figure 2, (20)) are associated to one or more functions enabled by a processor to which said contact sensitive component can be connected via said connection component (figures 2-7, column 1, lines 45-61, column 2, lines 30-67, column 3, lines 1-67 and column 4, lines 1-67).

As to claims 10 and 18, Imai teaches wherein said adjustable decoration comprises at least one light emitting diode which is controllable by a processing component (figures 2-7, column 1, lines 45-61, column 2, lines 30-67, column 3, lines 1-67 and column 4, lines 1-12).

As to claims 11 and 19, Imai teaches wherein said adjustable decoration comprises at least one electro-luminance pattern which is controllable by a processing component (figures 2-7, column 1, lines 45-61, column 2, lines 30-67, column 3, lines 1-67 and column 4, lines 1-67).

As to claim 12, Imai teaches an electronic device comprising a cover (figures 2-3), which cover comprises, a decoration case, figure 2, (20)) which is visible to a user when said cover is connected to an electronic device(figures 1-7 and column 3, lines 1-31) ; a contact sensitive component (electrodes, (figures 2-7, (15 and 41)), column 1, lines 45-61) arranged such that it generates an electrical signal when a part of said decoration associated to said contact sensitive component is touched (figures 2-7, column 1, lines 45-61, column 2, lines 30-67, column 3, lines 1-67 and column 4, lines 1-67); and; a connection component configured to electrically connect said contact sensitive component (figures 2-7, column 1, lines 45-61, column 2, lines 30-67, column 3, lines 1-67 and column 4, lines 1-67).

Imai does not teach a processor provided in a cover.

However, Nguyen teaches a processor provided in a cover (column 2, lines 15-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Nguyen's device having a processor in a cover into Imai's electronic system so as to provide protection for the processor (column 2, lines 20-25).

As to claim13, Imai teaches a data connection to said cover and a processing component configured to processing data received by said contact sensitive component of said cover (figures 2-7, column 1, lines 45-61, column 2, lines 30-67, column 3, lines 1-67 and column 4, lines 1-67).

As to claim 19, Imai teaches wherein said adjustable decoration comprises at least one electro-luminance pattern which is controllable by a processing component (figures 2-7, column 1, lines 45-61, column 2, lines 30-67, column 3, lines 1-67 and column 4, lines 1-67).

As to claim 28, Imai teaches wherein said adjustable decoration comprises at least one

light emitting diode which is controllable by a processing component (figures 2-7, column 1, lines 45-61, column 2, lines 30-67, column 3, lines 1-67 and column 4, lines 1-12).

As to claim 29, Imai teaches wherein said adjustable decoration comprises at least one electro-luminance pattern which is controllable by a processing component (figures 2-7, column 1, lines 45-61, column 2, lines 30-67, column 3, lines 1-67 and column 4, lines 1-67).

As to claim 30, Imai teaches a cover (figures 2-3) comprising: means for presenting a decoration (case, figure 2, (20)) which is visible to a user when said cover is connected to an electronic device; means for generating an electrical signal when a part of said decoration is touched (figures 1-7 and column 3, lines 1-31); and means for electrically
Imai does not teach a processor provided in a cover.

However, Nguyen teaches a processor provided in a cover (column 2, lines 15-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Nguyen's device having a processor in a cover into Imai's electronic system so as to provide protection for the processor (column 2, lines 20-25).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 8/24/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page 8, Applicant argued that "Imai does not disclose a cover comprising a processor provided in said cover ... but completely fails to suggest that the cover comprises a processor provided in said cover ... on page 9, Applicant argued that "in Imai, however, the relevant

features referred to are elements located on the board, not in the cover ... on page 10, Applicant argued that "Nguyen clearly do not contain a processor".

However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees for the following reasons, for instance, Imai discloses all claimed limitations, such as, a cover including an electronic device, a contact sensitive, a decoration and a connection component, but he does not expressly teaches processor provided in the cover. But the Examiner used the second cited reference Nguyen which clearly disclosed the claimed limitations, at least, "a processor provided in a cover" (column 2, lines 15-30).

Therefore, the combination of all references fairly discloses the claimed limitations, and all references should be taken in combination and not individually. The Applicant cannot show non-obviousness by attacking references individually where, as here the rejections are based on combination of references. In Keller, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Wolff (US 7,268,673 B2) teaches an electronic device with vibrator and an exchangeable cover.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS OFFICE ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mansour M. Said whose telephone number is 571-272-7679. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:30-6:00 P.M. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. EST. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Quan-Zhen Wang whose telephone number is 571-272-3114.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to: 571-273-8300 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to the Customer Service Window at the Randolph Building, 401, Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.

Art Unit: 2629

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/MANSOUR M SAID/
Examiner, Art Unit 2629

/Quan-Zhen Wang/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629